UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,320	10/17/2005	John L. Schenk	XY-Optimum-USNP	6962

28424 7590 10/21/2009

SANTANGELO LAW OFFICES, P. C.
125 SOUTH HOWES STREET
THIRD FLOOR
FORT COLLINS, CO 80521

EXAMINER	
GOUGH, TIFFANY MAUREEN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1657	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/21/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

barbh@idea-asset.com
cheryls@idea-asset.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/522,320	SCHENK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TIFFANY M. GOUGH	1657	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 September 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-12,15,16,18,21,150,151,154 and 155* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-12,15,16,18,21,150,151,154 and 155* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/1/2009 has been entered.

Claims 1, 4-12, 15, 16, 18, 21, 150, 151, 154, 155 are pending and have been considered on the merits. All arguments and amendments have been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The previous 112 1st rejections are withdrawn in light of applicant's amendment filed 9/1/2009 canceling the previously rejected claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 4-12, 15, 16, 18, 21,151,154, 155 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of each of WO 02/41906 A2 and WO 01/37655 A1 in view of each of Tardif et al. (Journal of Andrology, 1998) and Ellington (US 6140121) supported by Padilla et al (Journal of Animal Science, 1991), Johnson (Reprod. Fert. Dev., 1995) and Seidel et al., (Reproduction, 2002).

WO'906 teaches a method of separating sperm cells comprising obtaining a semen sample from a male mammal, particularly a bovine or equine mammal (p.9, lines 11-18), incubating the semen sample at temperatures ranging from 5-25°C, particularly 17-19°C (p.3, lines 28-33, all of p.4, p.5, lines 1-5), for a time period between 1-18 hours, determining a characteristic of the sperm cells, such as a sex characteristic, separating and collecting the sperm cells. WO'906 further teaches transporting the semen from one location to another during the incubation step, the use of an extender (p. 9, lines 1-33, all of p. 10) and antibacterial (Table 1), staining the sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 (p.11, lines 21-28, p. 15, lines 10—18) and separating the sperm cells using a flow cytometer (p.16, lines 1-15, p.18,lines 30-33, example 2, Table 2, Example 3,4,5).

WO'655 teaches a method of separating sperm cells comprising obtaining a semen sample from a male mammal, particularly a bovine or equine mammal (p.2, lines 20-32) incubating the semen sample at temperatures ranging from 5-25°C (p.10, lines 10-25), for a time period between 1-18 hours, determining a characteristic of the sperm cells, such as a sex characteristic, separating and collecting the sperm cells. WO '655 further teaches transporting the semen from one location to another during the incubation step (p.3), the use of an extender (p.7) and antibiotics (p.9, liens 25-33, Example 1), staining the sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 (Example 2,3) and separating the sperm cells using a flow cytometer (examples 2, 3).

The above references do not teach staining for a period of 30 minutes

Tardif teaches staining sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 for a period of 30 minutes (p. 202, Experiment 1, 2, Results section).

Johnson teaches a method of separating sperm cells comprising a flow cytometry method including staining sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 for less than or equal to 1 hour. They also teach the use of an extender (p. 900, Preparation of sperm for sorting viable sperm by flow cytomtery section).

Seidel teach a method of separating sperm cells comprising incubating semen at temperatues above liquid to gel phase transition, staining with Hoechst 33342 for a period of 45 minutes, separating and collecting said separated sperm cells (see p.736, Box 1, p.736, whole page, p. 734, DNA-binding dye section).

The above references do not teach adding caffeine to semen.

Ellington teaches the addition of caffeine to semen (col. 5, lines 44-46).

The references do not teach the specific extenders KMT. However, they do teach that proper extenders are well known to those skilled in the art and therefore one of skill in the art would choose a proper extender depending on the mammal. KMT and INRA

extenders are known in the art to be proper equine extenders, as supported by Padilla, who teach the use of KMT and INRA extenders for stallion semen at about 5°C.

At the time of the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the use a proper semen extender known in the art depending on the mammal.

At the time of the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have stained sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 for a period of 30 minutes with a reasonable expectation for successfully maintaining sperm motility because Tardif teaches that staining for a period of 30 minutes does not depress sperm motility. Further it would have been obvious to add caffeine to a semen sample as caffeine is well known in the art to be a sperm stimulant.

Further, adjusting the staining time period, dye concentration and amount of sperm cells stained would be well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention as a mere optimization of a result effective variable. *Support is provided by Johnson and Seidel who clearly teach that staining with Hoechst 33342 for less than 1 hour is successful in a sperm cell separating method.* Generally, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955) (Claimed process which was performed at a temperature between 40°C and 80°C and

an acid concentration between 25% and 70% was held to be prima facie obvious over a reference process which differed from the claims only in that the reference process was performed at a temperature of 100°C and an acid concentration of 10%.); see also Peterson, 315 F.3d at 1330, 65 USPQ2d at 1382 ("The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages."). See MPEP 2144.05.

Claims 1, 4-12, 15, 16, 18, 21, 148,149,150,152-154 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of each of WO 02/41906 A2 and WO 01/37655 A1 in view of Tardif et al. (Journal of Andrology, 1998) in further view of each of WO 02/28311 A1and Lindsey et al (ARS, 2001) supported by Johnson (Reprod. Fert. Dev., 1995) and Seidel et al., (Reproduction, 2002).

WO'906 teaches a method of separating sperm cells comprising obtaining a semen sample from a male mammal, particularly a bovine or equine mammal (p.9, lines 11-18), incubating the semen sample at temperatures ranging from 5-25°C, particularly 17-19°C (p.3, lines 28-33, all of p.4, p.5, lines 1-5), for a time period between 1-18 hours, determining a characteristic of the sperm cells, such as a sex characteristic, separating and collecting the sperm cells. WO'906 further teaches transporting the semen from one location to another during the incubation step, the use of an extender (p. 9, lines 1-33, all of p. 10) and antibacterial (Table 1), staining the sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 (p.11, lines 21-28, p. 15, lines 10—18) and separating the sperm cells

using a flow cytometer (p.16, lines 1-15, p.18,lines 30-33, example 2, Table 2, Example 3,4,5).

WO'655 teaches a method of separating sperm cells comprising obtaining a semen sample from a male mammal, particularly a bovine or equine mammal (p.2, lines 20-32) incubating the semen sample at temperatures ranging from 5-25°C (p.10, lines 10-25), for a time period between 1-18 hours, determining a characteristic of the sperm cells, such as a sex characteristic, separating and collecting the sperm cells. WO '655 further teaches transporting the semen from one location to another during the incubation step (p.3), the use of an extender (p.7) and antibiotics (p.9, liens 25-33, Example 1), staining the sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 (Example 2,3) and separating the sperm cells using a flow cytometer (examples 2, 3).

The above references do not teach staining for a period of 30 minutes

Tardif teaches staining sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 for a period of 30 minutes (p. 202, Experiment 1, 2, Results section).

Johnson teaches a method of separating sperm cells comprising a flow cytometry method including staining sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 for less than or equal to 1 hour. They also teach the use of an extender (p. 900, Preparation of sperm for sorting viable sperm by flow cytomtery section).

Seidel teach a method of separating sperm cells comprising incubating semen at temperatues above liquid to gel phase transition, staining with Hoechst 33342 for a period of 45 minutes, separating and collecting said separated sperm cells (see p.736, Box 1, p.736, whole page, p. 734, DNA-binding dye section).

The above references do not teach hysteroscopic insemination.

WO 311 teaches the use of hysterscopic insemination in combination with sex-sorted sperm stained with Hoechst 33342 (p. 10, lines 14-22) as well as increased fertilization rates (p.15, lines 3-20).

Lindsey teach a pregnancy rate of 70-90% for hysterscopic insemination in combination with sex-sorted sperm stained with Hoechst 33342 (p.281, p. 286) as well as a skim-milk glucose extender.

At the time of the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have stained sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 for a period of 30 minutes with a reasonable expectation for successfully maintaining sperm motility because Tardif teaches that staining for a period of 30 minutes does not depress sperm motility. Further it would have been obvious to use hysterscopic insemination because it is disclosed in the art by WO'311 and Lindsey to be an effective insemination method in combination with sex-sorted sperm.

Further, adjusting the staining time period, dye concentration and amount of sperm cells stained would be well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention as a mere optimization of a result effective variable. *Support is provided by Johnson and Seidel who clearly teach that staining with Hoechst 33342 for less than 1 hour is successful in a sperm cell separating method.* Generally, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955) (Claimed process which was performed at a temperature between 40°C and 80°C and an acid concentration between 25% and 70% was held to be prima facie obvious over a reference process which differed from the claims only in that the reference process was performed at a temperature of 100°C and an acid concentration of 10%.); see also Peterson, 315 F.3d at 1330, 65 USPQ2d at 1382 ("The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages."). See MPEP 2144.05.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/1/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In summary, applicant argues that the Tardif reference which was relied upon for the teaching of staining sperm cells for 30 minutes with Hoechst 33342, does not teach separating the sperm cells into X and Y chromosome bearing populations.

It is the examiner's position that it is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Hoechst 33342 for sperm sorting methods because Hoechst is well known to be non-toxic to sperm and is useful in assessing precise amounts of DNA in cells (see Seidel DNA-binding dyes section, p. 734). Hoechst has been used in the art for years, see art of record. Tardif was relied upon to teach that a staining period of 30 minutes is sufficient to stain sperm cells and not effect viability of sperm cells. Tardif also teach that Hoechst 33342 is useful in flow cytometry methods because the dye does not render the sperm cells infertile and has produced healthy calves. In addition they teach that fertility of sperm used for artificial insemination following staining with Hoechst 33342 was not affected (see p. 205, Discussion section, 2nd paragraph). Thus, applicants argument stating, "One skilled in the art would understand from reading this article that the stain experiments and tests would not be applicable to separating parameters for sperm cells as this reference does not mention separation at all" is **not persuasive**. Further, both Johnson and Seidel teach staining sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 for time periods of less than 1 hour in a separation method. Thus, Johnson and Seidel support the Examiners position that staining time and amount is mere optimization of a result effective variable. Therefore, applicants argument that the

invention of claim 1 yields unexpectable results not present in the prior art is not persuasive.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TIFFANY M. GOUGH whose telephone number is (571)272-0697. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jon Weber can be reached on 571-272-0925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ralph Gitomer/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1657

/Tiffany M Gough/
Examiner, Art Unit 1657